

15th November 1922]

A.—(1) The answer to the first part is in the negative, though in certain individual cases the principle was observed. The answer to the second part is in the affirmative.

(2) & (3) In districts in which the district health scheme has been introduced, deputy inspectors of vaccination who are now designated district health inspectors will deal with all epidemics; and the Government Order referred to is not now in force.

(4) The answer is in the affirmative. The Director of Public Health has sent a circular on 18th August 1922 calling for lists of fully qualified first-class vaccinators with a view to their appointment if found suitable as district health inspectors, when the district health scheme is introduced in all districts in April 1923.

(5) The Government have no information.

Encouragement of hand-spinning.

494 Q.—MR. A. TANGAVELU NAYAGAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state whether it is the view of the Government to popularize and encourage the use of hand-spinning wheels by all possible means?

A.—The view of Government is fully set forth in the speech of the hon. Mr. Venkatarreddi Nayudu in connexion with Mr. Vellingiri Gounder's resolution No. 174 regarding encouragement of hand-spinning and hand-weaving moved in the Council in December 1921.

II

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS FOR 1922-23.

Grant VII.

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"Mr. President, I beg to move

That the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 500 under '24-A (a) General Administration—Staff and Household of the Governor—Military Secretary to His Excellency the Governor—Contingencies—Purchase and Maintenance of pictures.'

"The necessity for this demand arose from a discovery by Mr. Hadaway who is in charge of the pictures at the Government House, of damage to certain pictures, those of Cornwallis and Eyre Coote, which were in need of serious repair. The recent provision in the budget under 'Contingencies—Purchase and Maintenance of Pictures'—is Rs. 800. Of this, Rs. 600 is remuneration to Mr. Hadaway. There is only Rs. 200 left for the renovation of these pictures. Of the Rs. 200, a major part has already been spent. As the repair of these pictures seems to be a serious and emergent matter, I am obliged to come to the House for this small sum of Rs. 500 in order that the necessary repairs may be done."

The motion was put and carried, and the grant was made.

[15th November 1922]

Grant IX.

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ Mr. President, I beg to move

That the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 1,095 under ‘ 22. General Administration’, on account of the increase of pay for the Assistant Secretary in the Law Department.

“ The Assistant Secretary in the Law Department is an officer of the Provincial Judicial Service, and he has been drafted into Madras as Assistant Secretary. The pay of his post in the Judicial Service is Rs. 600. When he was brought over here, he got an increase of work and a diminution in his emoluments. In order to equalize it he is given a small allowance of Rs. 100. In order to compensate him for his loss in coming over to Madras as well as the loss he has sustained in not being able to get a chance of acting as Subordinate Judge which he would otherwise have got, I have come to this House for a supplemental grant.”

The motion was put and carried, and the grant was made.

Grant XII.

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“ Mr. President, I beg to move

That the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 4,22,000 for the excess expenditure over the budget grant under Jails.

“ This, Sir, relates to the expenses incurred in connexion with the movement of the Mappilla prisoners. It is a big bill, and after certain observations made a day or two ago by way of comparison between the supplementary demands of the different departments of Government, it is rather unfortunate that it falls to my lot to bring this bill. The House will remember that, whenever a Member of the Government stands up for a supplementary grant, he is doing so with the advice of the united Government. I am rather more unfortunate than my colleagues inasmuch as I have in my portfolio certain items, as the Malabar rebellion, which naturally call for emergent and unexpected demands.

“ Now, I am afraid I cannot say that this demand is altogether unexpected.

11-15 a.m. It is quite true that when we drew up our budget, we were not in a position to have very definite or accurate information as to the number of Mappilla prisoners with whom we should have to deal. But apart from that, I found out before long that the amount that was placed at my disposal in the budget was not sufficient. This, of course, I may point out, is due to the unfortunate fact that the Council resolved during the budget last year to take off the lump sum of 2 lakhs of rupees from the jail provision. It was apparent that more provision would have to be made. But under the other heads such as sanitation charges, charges for the movement of prisoners, and so on, we omitted to make a small provision and in order to repair that defect also I have now come to the House. Under the heads of ‘ lock-ups,’ ‘ under-trial prisoners,’ etc., we actually made a provision which is less than that of any normal year. We knew perfectly well that we would have hundreds of under-trial prisoners.

“ Now, Sir, I do not know whether the Council would wish me to go into details of this demand. If so, I should be quite willing to do so. But I may remind them of one fact which they are already aware of, namely, that this matter has been carefully investigated in the Finance Committee. At

15th November 1922]

[Mr. A. R. Knapp.]

Grant XII—cont.

the meeting of the 30th October the Finance Committee considered the demand and asked for further details and then postponed its consideration. At the meeting held on the 11th November the Finance Committee in their minutes recommended certain proposals after scrutinizing the details. Unless the Members of the House would like me to go into the smallest details, I do not propose to do so."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—"Sir, I propose that this amount of Rs. 4,22,000 under Jail Administration, an additional sum of money in excess of expenditure over budgeted allotment, be reduced by Rs. 100. In so doing, I should like to draw the attention of the Council to the way in which the jail administration is conducted in this Presidency. Secondly, Sir, I should like to have certain information in connexion with this demand. In last March, when we were discussing the budget under this head, myself and some of the hon. Members of this House brought to the notice of the Government the inhuman treatment that was accorded to some of the political prisoners, and the hon. the Law Member who was in charge of this portfolio was kind enough to inform us that all human treatment was being accorded and Government was taking all precautions that were necessary in that direction, and that jail administration was being carried on with the utmost precaution. I beg to bring to the notice of this Council that this administration is far from satisfactory. Especially, I know how things were in the Berhampur jail. In the discussion that ensued in this House, I also brought to the notice of this Council how unsatisfactory and undesirable the state of things were in that jail. Even some salt was not given to the political prisoners of the jail with the result that they began to hunger-strike and a lot of money was spent."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"May I say, Sir, that there is nothing in this demand which concerns the Berhampur jail."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"It is a demand for excess expenditure over the budget grant under the head 'Jail Administration'. It is not stated that the demand under discussion is in connexion with the administration of some particular jails. So, the hon. Member can criticise the administration of jails in any portion of the Presidency."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"I could have made this explanation. I have not given details in my notice. If I had given details, Berhampur would not have come under this head."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Quite so. But the hon. Member has not done it. Therefore, the hon. Member, Mr. Biswanath Das, can criticise the jail administration in any portion of the Presidency."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—"Thank you for your ruling, Sir. Secondly, the hon. the Law Member was then pleased to promise us that instructions would be issued to the prosecuting agency to ask for fines. When the demand was objected to, he further promised that the utmost precaution would be taken to reduce the expenditure in this direction. He also promised that the question of releasing some of the Mappilla prisoners would be very carefully gone into. We should like to know how far this has been done. We asked the Government of India to abolish the system of deporting prisoners to Andamans which is now used as a penal settlement. We should like to know what has been done in this direction. Then, he was

[Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo] [15th November 1922]

Grant XII—cont.

further pleased to remark that the Government would make the camp jail of Bellary a permanent one, so that it might serve as a permanent penal settlement. Lastly, he said that the Government were considering the possibility of sending these prisoners on migration to some other countries. I should like to know what Government have done on these points. With these observations I beg to make my motion."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—" I beg to second this motion."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I should also like to ask for further information in connexion with the Mappilla prisoners. The hon. the Law Member, I think at the time of the budget, informed the Council that Government had the intention of releasing a certain number of men whose release would not be considered dangerous to public peace or order under certain conditions. We should like to know to what extent this promise has been fulfilled and how many prisoners have been released under the conditions then suggested. That is a matter on which we are entitled to ask for information even if the other questions of my hon. friend be not relevant. I think hon. Members will welcome such information, and I trust the hon. Member on behalf of Government will be able to tell us what has been done in the matter."

Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. RAMA RAO :—" Sir, I should like to request this House to pass this motion with a proviso that the construction of jails, if there are going to be new structures, should be so undertaken that they may be useful as schools or public buildings in the future. This is an extraordinary case which has brought into existence a large number of prisoners, and it is to be hoped that preventive measures are being taken so that such an occasion shall not arise in future. It would, therefore, be not prudent to spend a very large sum of money on permanent jails. With advancing views of civilization and contentment it is expected that schools should take the place of jails. I therefore request that this proviso should be added to this motion."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" I wish to make one or two remarks. I wish to draw the attention of the House to some facts which took place at the time of the budget discussion relating to jails. It will be remembered that a provision of over 9 lakhs was made for jails in excess of that provided for in the revised estimate. No doubt there were some exceptional causes which led to an increased expenditure, but it was found that there was nothing to justify such a large increase under this particular head. Secondly, there were several motions at the time of the discussion of the budget for reduction of the grant under this head. One motion was for a reduction of the grant by 9 lakhs. Another motion was for a reduction of the grant by $4\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs. A third motion was for a reduction of the grant by 2 lakhs. The most modest of them, namely, that the allotment be reduced by a sum of 2 lakhs was finally accepted by the House. While speaking on that motion the hon. the Law Member then stated :

We shall do everything that we can for the purpose of keeping down the jail population. We do not want to have a smaller budget provision and then come in again every time we may find it necessary. We have cut down the establishments as far as possible, or else we should have had three Superintendents and the necessary establishment in the camp jail, whereas we are now doing with one. In these circumstances, I do not think it would be proper to reduce the allotment by so much as two lakhs of rupees.

15th November 1922] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

Grant XII—cont.

“He stated that it would not be possible to effect retrenchment by a sum of Rs. 2 lakhs. In the end the Council voted for a reduction of the grant under this head by a sum of 2 lakhs. What do we find now? Not only have the anticipations of the hon. the Law Member not been fulfilled, but this motion asks for this very 2 lakhs plus a grant of Rs. 2,22,000 in excess of that amount. I would submit that unless very exceptional circumstances and satisfactory reasons are forthcoming for this increased expenditure we ought not to vote for this additional expenditure. As has been pointed out by my hon. friend Mr. Biswanath Das, the hon. the Law Member then suggested various directions in which retrenchment could be effected and threw out specific suggestions. We wish to know, before we are called upon to vote upon this motion, what attempts were made and to what extent the Government have succeeded. We wish to know whether all possible retrenchments have been effected before we are called upon to vote for this amount. If they are not furnished, I think that it is our duty to reject the motion.”

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“In this connexion I want to ask one thing, whether all the prisoners sentenced to a period of about one month should not be released. I am sorry the report is not clear. The figures which the report gives show that there are about five or six thousand of such prisoners every year. Morally, I think that the prisoners sentenced to one month will not find it very congenial or useful to be in jail for such a short period and I would therefore suggest that hereafter people for petty offences who are sentenced for only one month should be acquitted or fined and that instructions should be given to release those prisoners as soon as they come to jail. That will materially affect the prison question, as they say that the increased allotment is due to abnormal rise in the number of prisoners. Some time back I suggested this to Government by means of question. I think it is worth while that the hon. the Law Member considers this matter and sees that those prisoners who have been sentenced for only one month and who are now in jail are released.”

RAO BABADUR T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“We expect, Sir, that in 11-30 a.m. these matters, the wishes of the Council would be given effect to properly. What the member in charge of the jails has done is that instead of understanding the real intent of the vote, and instead of giving effect to the real wishes of the Council, he reduced the dieting charges of these prisoners in the temporary jails by Rs. 1,70,000. So, while the Legislative Council wanted a permanent reduction of Rs. 2,00,000 in the administrative charges of the jails, this temporary item, namely, the dieting charges of the Mappilla prisoners, was reduced by Rs. 1,70,000. That is not, I beg to submit, giving effect to the wishes of the Legislative Council. The remaining Rs. 30,000 were also found more or less from these temporary items that were provided for the Mappilla prisoners in the temporary jails. So, as I said, instead of giving effect to the wishes of the Council and really reducing the permanent expenditure on [the jails by Rs. 2,00,000 as the Council wanted to do, the actual reductions have been made in the dieting charges in some temporary jails. Unless the hon. Member in charge of the department is prepared to accept at least hereafter the wishes of the Council and give effect to them in the proper way, I beg

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [15th November 1922]

Grant XII—cont.

to submit that the Council is bound to show its sense of the way in which its vote has been treated. In that view, Sir, I support the motion that has been made by Mr. Das.

"As regards the proposed expenditure of the amount of Rs. 4,22,000 itself, no doubt it is due to causes which are said to be beyond the control of the department and which have been necessitated by the temporary nature of the jails in which Mappilla prisoners have been placed, and the fact that the Military wanted to withdraw the guard they supplied originally. So, sitting on the Finance Committee, we allowed this item to go before this Council and we also recommended that the Council might sanction this particular grant. But as I said already I am supporting the present motion of Mr. Das not on account of want of justification for the items that appear under this particular grant, but on account of the way in which the vote of this Council has been treated by the hon. Member in charge of the Jails, and I think the Legislative Council ought to show its sense of the way in which its mandate has been, I may say, misused by the Member in charge. So I would support the motion of Mr. Das and unless the hon. Member is prepared to give an undertaking that at least in future the wishes of the Council would be carried out, they are bound to support the motion."

MR. P. SIVA RAO :—"Mr. President, I wish to say one word in regard to this motion. I am a resident of Bellary and I think it is on the jail there that this grant, if passed, is to be spent. I want one piece of information from the Government. Hitherto a special police force was appointed for patrol purposes for escorting the Mappilla prisoners. Now I hear that a Special Military Force, two regiments or so, has been brought in specially for the purpose of escorting or patrolling the band of Mappilla prisoners in the jail there. I want to know what necessity there was for bringing in the Military with an expenditure of four lakhs and odd, and whether the Government want to spend this amount on the upkeep of the Military force about 400 in number."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Mr. President, with regard to the last enquiry made by my hon. friend Mr. Siva Rao, the answer is that the people of Bellary for months past have been anxious to have troops in order to protect them against the wild Mappillas. Although I must confess it was against my own wishes, we in consultation with the Government of India agreed to comply with that request. The cost on account of the force would not in fact fall on this Government's purse at all, except to this extent that, having taken for the use of the force the European barracks, we found ourselves compelled to meet the cost of doing some repairs to some small barracks which the troops now occupy."

"Then, Sir, there was a question asked by Mr. Ramachandra Rao as regards the release of the Mappilla prisoners, whether the undertaking entered into by my hon. friend the Law Member at the time of the budget discussion had been carried out. Five hundred Mappilla prisoners have been released on bonds for good conduct in August and a further seven hundred have either since been released or are under orders of release. I may, perhaps, mention as a matter of interest that I am not quite so sure of the policy of making these releases. We had a letter the other day from the District Magistrate of Malabar in which he drew a not very re-assuring picture of the conditions in the Mappilla area at the present moment."

15th November 1922]

[Mr. A. R. Knapp.]

Grant XII—cont.

Among other things he mentioned that the Mappillas have completely misunderstood these releases and that they look upon it as a sign of abject weakness on the part of the Government which has arisen from the recent triumph of the Angora Government. Now, Sir, if the people do not want them to be released, I do not think this House would wish to release them.

"Mr. Rama Rao's suggestion in connexion with this motion, namely, that in the construction of new jails we should take care to see that the buildings to be put up are suitable for other purposes afterwards, if necessary, is attractive and it seems to be good. But this suggestion is intended to be carried out when building new jails, but not in the case of temporary accommodation. The more substantial buildings, belonging to the Military, have now been repaired for their use. Any excess of buildings or structures, I may just mention, will be extremely useful in carrying out the recommendations of the Jails Commission as regards segregation and so forth.

"Some remarks have been made by Mr. Krishna Rao suggesting economy in the matter of establishments. That suggestion also has been carried out. We have now at Bellary a jail consisting of some 5,000 prisoners, and the staff for the whole jail consists of only one Superintendent and one Deputy Superintendent. Now, I may just mention that if we take the standard of the other central jails, at least three superintendents would be required for this jail, because the strength of a normal central jail is not more than 1,500 prisoners.

"Then, Sir, comes the general question as to why this department has not kept itself within the budget limits. Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar is himself a member of the Finance Committee and in that capacity I take it that he has had access to a certain number of Government papers. And although I do not want to give away the secrets of the Government to the House, I think I am entitled, so far as he is concerned, to say that it was not the Member for Jails that made the proposal for this grant, but it was the Finance Department. The Member in charge of Jails had nothing to do with it. . . ."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"The question I raise here is this. So far as this item of Rs. 4,22,000 is concerned, we considered the proposal was all right and we passed it in the Committee. But the Government have not given effect in any real sense to the vote of this Council on the Budget. So, in view of the fact that we did not approve of the way in which our vote was treated, I said that I was supporting the motion of Mr. Das."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"I may just say, Sir, that my hon. friend might have meant the Government when he referred to the Member in charge of the jails. The Member in charge of the jails as such has nothing to do with the convictions or sentences of prisoners. He is in charge of jail administration. . . ."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"I was talking of the Member in charge, Sir, as an officer. If there is a change, and if it was his predecessor who was responsible for the reductions made, that is another thing. It is the Government as such that are responsible for it. We do not know who is responsible for the reduction of the several items, but what the

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [15th November 1922]

Grant XII—cont.

Council wanted was a reduction of Rs. 2,00,000. The distribution of it among the several items is left to the Government as a whole, no matter whether it is done by the Finance department or the Member in charge of the jails; that is a secret which is well kept among themselves."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"So far as that is concerned, I can assure the hon. Member that if on another occasion the Council cuts down an allotment under Jails to a figure which is obviously insufficient to feed and clothe the prisoners and give them the necessary shelter, then I would probably have to come to the Council and ask them to feed and clothe them. With the question of the number of prisoners the Jail department has nothing to do. You may reduce the number or increase it, but what the Jail department has to do is to keep the prisoners under watch and feed them. Even the question of the actual amount of money needed is, I submit, outside the control of the Jail department."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I have nothing to add, Sir, as I think that all the questions asked about my previous speech have been answered by my hon. colleague."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"Sir, I do not propose to go into the details of this supplementary demand, as I have already done so in great detail on two occasions with the Finance Committee. But I feel that I ought to lose no opportunity of protesting against the policy which has been enunciated here by one of the members of that Committee, although he did not enunciate it in committee. He accuses the Government of having abused the mandate of the Council. Now, what was that mandate? I take it that it was that the Government should do what the Council found it impossible to do. The Government placed their estimates for jail administration for the ensuing year before the Council. The Council went into the estimates in detail, and various members suggested specific reductions which they were unable to carry. Having failed to satisfy the Council that any of the specific items which they had attacked were unnecessary, they then proceeded to move for a general reduction. In other words, they came before the Government and said: 'We cannot find anything wrong in your estimates, but we call upon you to discover items to be cut out to make a reduction of two lakhs.' I should like to ask the hon. Member to apply a policy of this sort to his domestic affairs. I would like him to consider how he would stand if, after examining his household accounts and finding that he was unable to show that he had been charged too much in any particular item, he were then to direct the manager of his household to supply him with food at Rs. 100 a month less. What would be the result of such a policy? I think people who have tried it with their butlers find generally that the only result is that the butler adds on to the estimate something for his master to take off. The policy of making these lump deductions when the attempt to indicate specific items that are excessive has failed seems to be an attempt to drive us to something like this, and it is an attempt which I feel bound to resist."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"This is a general question, Sir."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Order, order. Of course, the only ground upon which an hon. Member could rise and interrupt any speech is that he

15th November 1922]

[The President]

Grant XII—cont.

is rising to a point of order or making a personal explanation. Even a personal explanation may well be reserved to the end of the speech."

Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar rose to speak.

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"May I point out that I have not yet resumed my seat? It is well understood that when the President is on his feet no other hon. Member should get up and interrupt him. The only ground for an intervening speech on the part of any Member is that he rises to a point of order. That must be done immediately. Or, if he is misrepresented or misquoted, he can get up and offer correction. If he wants to make a personal explanation, that may more advantageously be done as soon as the Member making a speech has finished the same. But during a debate it would not be proper that there should be frequent interruptions because there are differences of opinion. I would appeal to hon. Members to consider if what I have indicated is not the proper course.

"Now, may I take it that the hon. Member (Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar) wants to rise to a point of order?"

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"I rise, Sir, on a matter of personal explanation. I am practically misunderstood and misquoted. That is what I want to make clear.

"The question raised by the hon. the Finance Member is a question of policy whether a reduction by a lump sum is correct or not. 11-45 a.m. That is not a question which may be raised here. What I said was on the vote of censure; that is what the resolution of Mr. Biswanath Das amounts to. I want to take objection to the course that has been adopted by the Government, namely, that of reducing the very items which the hon. Member in charge of Jails did not want to be touched, namely, dietary charges and medical charges. But reductions have been made exactly in respect of those two items. As a matter of fact, the Council wanted to reduce only other items. So the objection taken by the hon. the Finance Member does not apply."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"May I say one word, Sir? When this reduction of two lakhs came up I pointed out most definitely that 'it was a question of food or no food; if you are going to reduce this two lakhs of rupees out of the nine lakhs provided for the Mappilla prisoners, then it will mean a famine budget'."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, the hon. Member Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar objects to my speaking on the general question, because he says that is not in issue. I venture to say that it is the sole issue on which he spoke. He tells us that, as a member of the Finance Committee, he is ready to pass this particular item of Rs. 4,22,000. But he wishes to object to the failure of the Government to carry out the two lakhs reduction. That is the sole issue on which he dwelt in his speech.

"As regards the question of food, as my hon. colleague has just explained, he told the Council at the time that there was no question of option in the matter. He said 'so far as this reduction is concerned, it is a question of food or no food and it is a famine budget that we have prepared so far as jails are concerned.'

[Sir Charles Todhunter] [15th November 1922]

Grant XII—cont.

"I should like to say finally that, if there is any means of making this two lakhs reduction, I sincerely hope that Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar will point it out to us as a member of the Finance Committee in its retrenchment *avatar* (laughter).

"I am afraid I must make one explanation regarding the inner working of the Government machine which has gone wrong, but not in this instance because of diarchy. The hon. Member in charge of Jails says that it is the Finance Department that made the particular reduction that is in question. As a matter of fact, I believe, if he will examine the matter again, he will find that the reductions made were ordered in pursuance of the recommendations of the Inspector-General of Prisons."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Sir, I had no intention of taking part in this debate, but certain observations made by my friends Mr. Ramachandra Row and Mr. Knapp make it necessary that I should say one or two words with reference to the release of the Mappilla prisoners. At the time of the budget, hon. Members may remember that when the suggestion was made on behalf of the Government that they were going to release some of those Mappilla prisoners, I objected to that, warning the Government against the possible consequences of such a release. But no heed was taken of my warning at the time. Now, it is very interesting to find that my prophecy has been fulfilled and that Mr. Ellis, the Collector of Malabar, says, as the hon. Mr. Knapp has told us just now, that the conditions arising from the release of these Mappilla prisoners are not quite satisfactory. I quoted also the other statement mentioned by the hon. Member that Mr. Ellis had said that feelings were aroused in Malabar owing to the Angora successes. Even if the Angora Government had not succeeded, those undesirable consequences referred to by the Collector of Malabar would have occurred. I even now make the same statement and give the same warning to Government that it will not be safe to the peace of the country in general and to the peace of Malabar in particular to release them. After all, the rebellion began in August 1921, and more than one year has already elapsed, and the conditions of release apply only to those prisoners who have been convicted by the magistrates, and the magistrates have been empowered to pass sentences only up to a limit of two years; so that practically a portion of the terms of imprisonment of those persons has already expired and the Government have not to wait long before these sentences fully expire. I think it will be extremely desirable in the interests of the peace of the country and in the interests of the administration that those Mappilla prisoners who have not yet completed their periods of sentence should not be released before their time. As regards those that have been already released, it is now too late to do anything. But with reference to those who have been ordered to be released but not yet released and with reference to those whom it is contemplated to release, I again ask the Government not to release them."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—"Mr. President, Sir, if I rise to speak in connexion with this application for a further sum of Rs. 4,22,000 for jails, I do not do so with a view to oppose the grant. Sitting in the Finance Committee, I have satisfied myself that this grant is necessary. But at the same time I cannot help drawing the attention of the House to the fact that there has been some gross blundering in the way the budget for this particular

15th November 1922] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar]

Grant XII—cont.

head has been prepared. The Council has been referred by the hon. the Finance Member to the fact that the Law Member said at the time the budget was under discussion that the dietary charges were prepared more or less on a famine scale. It was also said by other speakers that out of the two lakhs out made during the budget season Rs. 1,70,000 was taken out of the dietary charges provided for the prisoners. May I mention to the House that the budget, as originally presented to this House, was prepared on the footing that there would be 12,000 prisoners to be fed. But they ultimately realized that there were only 9,000 prisoners to be fed and therefore a sum of Rupees 1,70,000 being taken away would not mean a reduction in the allowance of food necessary for the prisoners.

"But the question which I would bring to the notice of the House is this: that out of Rs. 4,22,000 now asked for Rs. 90,000 and odd is made up of salaries, allowances, etc., for about 250 additional warders (only 107 warders being originally budgeted for), for two assistant surgeons, 12 sub-assistant surgeons, 20 ward boys and other people and their salaries and their feeding expenses. I put the question, how the matter of dietary expenses on the basis of 12,000 prisoners came in the budget where there were only 9,000 prisoners. It did not then occur to the authorities concerned that the extent of their proposal of having 107 warders was too low and that there should be 250 additional warders, assistant surgeons, sub-assistant surgeons, etc. It occurred to them only later on that additional numbers should be provided for in the scheme. I do not know who is responsible for this bungling of the question. I know as regards the other sum of Rs. 3,30,000 that it is consequent upon the motion of this Council that was passed at a previous meeting, namely, that additional accommodation must be provided in the various central jails for the purpose of receiving additional prisoners. This Rs. 3,30,000 is the additional sum incurred in connexion with providing the necessary establishment, etc., for all those additional jails. So, I put this question, 'how was it that this question of additional warders and various other people was not recognized when they provided for nearly one-third more than the number of prisoners that they had?'"

MR. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—"As Government has little to lose by the reduction which has been proposed, I trust that the hon. Member will not press his motion to a division but will ask leave of the House for withdrawing it. The hon. Member has gained his point by raising a debate and eliciting information. Much light has been thrown on the manner in which budgets are prepared. It is necessary both on the part of the Government and the Council that they should exercise stricter scrutiny over expenditure. I cannot for one moment subscribe to the doctrine enunciated by the hon. the Finance Member when he told us that if this Council made lump sum reductions they could not be treated seriously, but that we should point out the exact details of such reductions. Now, if the Council were an executive body, that would obviously be one of its duties. But it is not, and we have to go through a voluminous budget in a very short time, and I believe, as I pointed out yesterday, that the Council can only point out the chief directions in which economies should be effected and that Government should settle the details where the economies must be carried out. I say it is perfectly legitimate for this Council to make lump sum

[Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi] [15th November 1922]

Grant XII—cont.

reductions. A similar thing was being done in Parliament after the war and no financier has considered it as wrong on the part of the Parliament. The Legislative Council can only say so much money is available, and it is not possible for this Council to go further and make specific reductions, except probably in the transferred departments. Firstly, we have not the time to do it; secondly, we have not the details; thirdly, we have not got, so far as the reserved departments are concerned, that control over the personnel which is after all the crux of the whole matter. It is by control of Ministers that Parliament effects economies. There is a further matter for dissatisfaction in the country to which I gave vent here. We do not know how much has been saved from the reserved departments, what the total of the supplementary grants has been till now, and from what sources Government will be able to meet these supplementary demands which they are constantly making. It is now clear that much reduction has not been made in the reserved portions and much has been taken from the transferred subjects. I think we must be treated much better in the matter of these transactions.

“At the same time I may tell my hon. friend Mr. Das that a reduction by a hundred rupees is not going to result in any economy and I hope he will see his way to withdraw his motion.”

12 noon. Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—“Sir, I beg leave to withdraw my motion.”

The motion of Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo was then by leave of the House withdrawn.

The demand was put and carried. The grant was made.

Grant XIX.

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU :—“Sir, I beg to move

That the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 1,100 under ‘34-A. Agriculture—I. Director of Agriculture’.

“This has reference, Sir, to the allowance that should be paid to the Statistical Assistant to the Director of Agriculture. Hon. Members will remember that at the time of the budget discussion, in cutting down some of the allowances allowed to officers, this officer was one that came in for his share. But in doing so, the Legislative Council cut down the allowances of a few officers while they retained the allowance of certain other officers. Among those whose allowances were not cut down are to be found three Under Secretaries to Government getting an allowance of Rs. 200 a month, one Assistant to the Board of Revenue, Rs. 200, Presidency Magistrates, Rs. 300 and Rs. 100 each, and one Secretary to Government, Rs. 200. At that time I brought to the notice of the House the invidious distinction that has been made, and observed that if finally it turned out that some officers in the City of Madras were allowed to draw allowances and others in the same locality were disallowed the allowance, it might be necessary for me to come up with a supplementary grant. So far as the departments under my charge were concerned, four officers (two of whom are in the Agricultural department) were disallowed their allowances. I placed the case of all

15th November 1922] [Mr. K. Venkatareddi Nayudu]

Grant XIX—cont.

these officers before the Finance Committee; but the Committee asked me to apply to this House by way of grant, only so far as this special Statistical Assistant is concerned. They distinguished his case from the rest by saying, as I submitted to them, that he was a special officer whose special skill and efficiency was required for the purpose of satisfactorily discharging the duties of that office. I have applied only for Rs. 1,100 because the amount for the month of March will be put in the next year's budget. I hope that the House will pass it and, if necessary, some Members of the Finance Committee will bear me out in what I have said."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" Mr. President, I think we all knew where we were when we cut down all these allowances. Considerable enthusiasm was manifested at the last budget time when we voted that all these allowances should go. Of course, some allowances were cut down and some were retained. Some officers in the Secretariat had been allowed to draw these allowances and others probably were disallowed these allowances. Some men in the Collectorate and in the mufassal got them and some did not. Undoubtedly there was considerable confusion at that time. So that now the whole question of these allowances is a matter requiring a thorough examination. Just now, in connexion with another vote which we passed, we have granted an allowance to an Assistant Secretary of the Law Department."

The hon. Mr. K. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" Sir, I am sorry I called it an 'allowance'. He was only put on a higher incremental scale, a scale that is already in existence."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—" I do not know, Sir, whether it is a question of allowance or a question of putting one on a higher incremental scale. All that we are concerned with is the question of retrenchment. I am really surprised that the Members of the Finance Committee, who are as keen as any one of us on retrenchment, should have given their approval to this allowance and have sent it up to this House for vote. I understand that one of the functions of the Retrenchment Committee or the Finance Committee is that they should examine the question of all the allowances and (in three months or so) send a report to Government for consideration as to which of these allowances should be kept up and which disallowed. So, if this question is engaging the attention of the Members of the Committee, I do not think that this question of a special allowance to this or that particular officer should now come up for consideration by us. Even if this is accepted, I lay great deal of stress to the question of allowances being looked into in some detail and a principle being evolved for the grant of same. I realize that this is a case of a special officer asked to do some special work and he may be deserving of this special consideration in one of the transferred departments. There are many other deserving men in the other departments. . . ."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" I may mention the case of the Special Settlement Officers."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" They belong to the Reserved departments."

[15th November 1922]

Grant XIX—cont.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I must mention that whether it is the Reserved or the Transferred department, our only concern is a financial one and I strongly repudiate the insinuation contained in his statement."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"May I explain that what I said was that the officers of the Reserved departments are not coming forward for any such allowance?"

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, all of us are really interested in seeing that a uniform principle is evolved for the grant of such allowances, and I think the better course would be to wait for the report of the Finance Committee as to the grant of these allowances before putting such things to the vote of the House."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, the question of allowances generally is now under the consideration of the Finance Committee as the hon. Mr. Ramachandra Rao said. We are dealing with this question of allowances as a general question and in that we make no difference between the reserved and the transferred half or between one department and another. What we are attempting is to evolve a general policy under which every thing can come in. No doubt, in doing so, certain particular difficulties are felt in dealing with the Reserved departments. For, if we would cut down the allowance in certain cases, they say they would increase the salaries of the office and call it special pay. That is to say, it is another way of circumventing the views of this Council who do not want to give these allowances. The difficulty is therefore felt since they wanted to give a special pay for posts for which the Committee would not grant an allowance."

"With regard to the particular case before us now, we allowed it to go before the Council for the reason that it is a case of a special appointment. It was represented to us and we were satisfied that the person who holds the appointment is a man that has had special training at Calcutta and has had a better offer from elsewhere. It is not therefore right that a person with such qualifications should be placed in the general scale. As I said, this is not a case of general allowance; it is the case of a special officer who has had special training and who has been appointed in a special place. It is in view of these things that we allowed this to go forward to the House. In the other case that was mentioned, it was a case of promotion in a department under the reserved half of the Government and unless it was passed there was certain to be a special pay fixed. So, Sir, there is a special reason why we allowed this case to come before the Council."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I believe that in matters affecting policy we cannot make a difference between the reserved and transferred portion (hear, hear). We have been at sea not knowing exactly where we are. The Council considered the question of the grant of the allowances at the time of the budget discussion. We cut out certain allowances and objection was at once taken to the drawing of such an invidious distinction between one case and another and we expected the Finance Committee to scrutinize these matters."

15th November 1922]

Grant XIX—cont.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" We are actually working at it."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" I am glad to hear it. I would now ask whether, before the Finance Committee has decided the matter one way or the other, it is reasonable to ask us to vote on this question? Without any definite policy in this matter, are we to accept it as an exceptional case? If we accept it, I do not know what other cases may be brought forward for similar consideration. Unless we have a list of such special cases before us with the necessary information as to the special qualifications, etc., I am afraid we shall be doing an injustice in accepting this motion. I would, therefore, request the Minister to postpone asking for the additional grant till the Finance Committee has evolved a principle for guidance in these matters as to which are the special cases in which these allowances should be paid. If the Council is going to make the grant of allowances a matter of course, I should say that it is rather a bad policy. In the absence of any set policy we shall be taking a leap in the dark if we accept this motion."

MR. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—" In view of the opposition from certain quarters to this motion, as a member of the Finance Committee myself I think I had better explain the position. The gentleman to whom this special grant is to be paid has had a special training in Calcutta. His services are considered so valuable that when he received an offer of an appointment from the Government of India on a better pay, the Madras Government declined to spare his services. It would, therefore, be a great hardship on him if his services, which are so very much appreciated in other places and which are offered to be better paid for, were to be retained without even an allowance by way of compensating him for the loss he should be suffering. It was under these circumstances, Sir, that we thought that the allowance sought to be given must be paid though as a poor consolation and I therefore appeal to the House to support the motion."

12-15 p.m.

On the motion of Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu a poll was taken with the following result :—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 19. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar. |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 20. Diwan Bahadur C. Arunachala Mudaliyar. |
| 3. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. | 21. Mr. B. P. Devarajulu Nayudu. |
| 4. " the Raja of Panagal. | 22. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar. |
| 5. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu. | 23. Rao Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. |
| 6. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 24. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. |
| 7. " Mr. A. R. Knapp. | 25. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. |
| 8. Mr. F. J. Richards. | 26. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. |
| 9. " K. G. Grieve. | 27. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. |
| 10. Rev. E. M. Macphail. | 28. " K. A. Kandaswami Kandar. |
| 11. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton. | 29. " P. C. Muttu Chettiyar. |
| 12. " E. Periyannayagam. | 30. " A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. |
| 13. " R. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. | 31. " Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. |
| 14. " A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. | 32. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar. |
| 15. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 33. Mr. V. P. Pakkiriswami Pillai. |
| 16. Mr. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad Bahadur. | 34. " C. Ponnuswami Nayudu. |
| 17. Dr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu. | 35. " P. T. Rajan. |
| 18. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu. | 36. " K. Sarabha Reddi. |
| | 37. " K. Sitarama Reddi. |

[15th November 1922]

Grant XIX—cont.

Ayes—cont.

- | | |
|---|--|
| 38. Diwan Bahadur T. N. Sivagnanam Pillai. | 57. Rev. W. Meston. |
| 39. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai. | 58. Hamid Sultan Marakkayar Sahib Bahadur. |
| 40. „ A. Subbarayudu. | 59. Saiyid Ibrahim Ravuttar. |
| 41. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. | 60. Khan Sahib Muhammad Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib. |
| 42. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. | 61. Khan Sahib Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib. |
| 43. „ V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. | 62. Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razaak Sahib. |
| 44. „ C. Venkataranga Reddi. | 63. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Sadulla Badsha Sahib. |
| 45. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 64. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib. |
| 46. „ Sir T. Desika Achariyar. | 65. Rao Bahadur M. C. Raja. |
| 47. Mr. S. Muttumanickachari. | 66. Mr. R. T. Kesavalu Pillai. |
| 48. „ K. V. Ramachari. | 67. Rao Sahib M. C. Madura Pillai. |
| 49. Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. Rama Rao. | 68. Diwan Bahadur Govindoss Chaturbhujappa Doss. |
| 50. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. | 69. Rao Bahadur T. Numbermal Chettiyar. |
| 51. „ S. Arpudawami Udayar. | 70. Mr. A. E. Rencontre. |
| 52. Rai Sahib E. C. M. Mascarenhas. | 71. „ T. Richmond. |
| 53. Mr. A. T. Palmer. | 72. „ W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. |
| 54. „ M. Ratnaswami. | |
| 55. Sri Meka V. Apparao Bahadur. | |
| 56. Mr. C. R. T. Congreve. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 8. Sriman Sasibhushan Rath Mahasayo. |
| 2. „ K. P. Gopala Menon. | 9. „ Biswanath Das Mahasayo. |
| 3. „ B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 10. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhaacharlu. |
| 4. Diwan Bahadur M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu. | 11. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 5. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. | 12. Mr. T. Sivagankaram Pillai. |
| 6. Mr. P. Siva Rao Garu. | 13. „ B. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 7. „ C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | 14. „ T. C. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| | 15. „ T. Arumainatha Pillai. |

The motion was carried, 72 voting for and 15 against it.

The grant was made.

Grant XXIII.

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“ Sir, I beg to move

That the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 9,630 for the excess expenditure over the budget grant under ‘Civil Works’ required for the acquisition of land for extension to the Central Jail, Vizagapatam.

“This is a very simple matter. This sum of Rs. 9,630 was allotted at the end of November last for the purpose of the acquisition of certain land required for the construction of quarters at the Vizagapatam Central Jail. Unfortunately, the acquisition which was thought would have been put through by the end of that year was not completed, with the result that the money was unspent and lapsed, and I now ask the Council to renew the grant of last year so that the acquisition of the land required may be proceeded with.”

The motion was put and carried, and the grant was made.

Grant XXX.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Mr. President, I beg to move

That the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 6,000 under the head ‘46. Stationery and Printing’ for the installation of electric motors at the Penitentiary Branch Press.

“I believe the Council are aware of the conditions under which this press is carried on. It is worked by prisoners and for power they have a 10 horse-power oil-engine. This engine is not only hopelessly overloaded, but it is

15th November 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

Grant XXX—cont.

quite unequal, even if it is in good order, for the work that is now being put upon it. The result is that it is constantly breaking down. The question of replacing the engine has now been under consideration for two or three years, but was postponed owing to a larger scheme for reorganizing the whole of the presses in Madras. That scheme has had to be abandoned owing to financial considerations and we have now to carry on in the best way we can with the presses we have. In order to satisfy the hon. Mr. Ramachandra Rao, I may assure him that we have endeavoured to secure this Rs. 6,000 by reappropriation, but owing to our having just carried out a scheme for the revision of the salaries of the staff, which has taken up all the money that we had to spare, we have to come before the Council for this grant of Rs. 6,000."

The motion was put and carried, and the grant was made.

III

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE REORGANIZATION OF THE MADRAS UNIVERSITY, 1922.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The House will now resume consideration of the Bill to provide for the reorganization of the Madras University."

Diwan Bahadur Sir T. DESIKA ACHARIYAR :—"Mr. President, the hon. the Minister for Education in his impassioned and eloquent speech yesterday directed many of the remarks connected with this subject to Trichinopoly and he constantly looked at me and made the remarks so that I thought it was necessary for me to reply to them.

"It is not my purpose this morning to say anything against the benefits which must accrue by the organization of a residential and teaching university in the City of Madras. I do not advocate a policy which would be calculated to embody the complaint, that if I have not got the benefit, the City of Madras ought not to have any benefit at all. That is not the object. The object with which I rise to make a few observations upon this Bill is this. There is a considerable amount of apprehension entertained in connexion with the disastrous consequences that will follow to the mufassal colleges by the enactment of this Act. If this Bill becomes law, it is felt by heads of colleges in the mufassal, with whom I had a conference, that there would be a fall in the attendance of their colleges. It is also felt that their colleges, by reason of being called mufassal colleges as contra-distinguished from the colleges within the ten-mile radius referred to in the Bill which are called constituent colleges, would occupy a subordinate position; and their fear also is that by reason of this elimination of the mufassal colleges from their equal place with the constituent colleges as hitherto the pupils would think that the mufassal colleges are colleges which are very inferior to the colleges at Madras. The answer to that, Sir, is not to say that the mufassal is mufassal and the city is city, that any difference that there is now will continue to exist and that therefore there is no reason to complain. I invited the hon. the Minister to Trichinopoly to preside over the functions of the National College anniversary and I requested him to make a statement to the heads of colleges and to the persons interested in